

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,245	11/10/2003	Yuan-Tsong Chen	16743-003001 / 12A-920716	3196
26181 FISH & RICHA	7590 04/23/2007 A R D S O N P C		EXAMINER	
PO BOX 1022	PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		KAPUSHOC, STEPHEN THOMAS	
MINNEAPOL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/705,245		CHEN ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Stephen Kapushoc	1634		

	Stephen Kapushoc	1634					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
HE REPLY FILED 21 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.	•					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection of the final rejection of the first REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	, will not be entered be	ecause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beto	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
appeal; and/or	nor rollin for appear by materially re	adding or oimpinying					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1							
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appear	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.  Other:							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed New Claim 26 is drawn to a method of assessing risk in a patient that is 'a Mongoloid or a descendent of a Mongoloid' where the previously presented claims did not require any such limitation. As such the claims would require further search and consideration of the art at least to determine any possible concerns regarding the enablement of the claimed method with respect to the requirements of 35 USC 112 1st ¶. Furthermore, the specification of the instant application does not particularly mention any 'Mongoloid' population, and as such the proposed new claim would require consideration under 35 USC 1st ¶ to determine whether or not the claim is considered new matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants remarks of 03/21/2007 drawn to the applicability of the HLA-B\*1502 allele for use as an indicator of sensitivity to carbamazepine have been addressed in the 'Response to Remarks' presented in the Final Office Action of 12/18/2006. The Examiner has maintained that the instant application provides no evidence of any causal relationship between the HLA-B\*1502 allele and development of an adverse reaction to carbamazepine treatment, while the cited art provides teachings of the unpredictability with regard to whether or not the marker is predictive in any population. It is noted that the proposed amended claims submitted 03/21/2007 have not been entered, as addressed earlier in this Advisory Action, and as such the Remarks directed to New Claim 26 (p.10 of Remarks) are moot.

BJ FORMAN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINED